the hunters after a lost Atlantis, were they informed upon the facts which science itself so plainly teaches, could ask no stronger argument for either of their positions. But such persons are usually not so informed, and it seems almost impossible for them to become so and still hold such views, for, fortunately, knowledge is a poison that contains its own antidote, and the very possession of the facts suffices to preclude a perverse use of them.

XLV.—Descriptions of new Species of Reptiles and Batrachians in the British Museum.—Part II. By G. A. BOULENGER.

Blanus Bedriagæ, sp. n.

In a recent paper *, Dr. J. v. Bedriaga has established the specific distinctness of two forms of Amphisbænas which have hitherto been confounded under the name of Blanus cinereus, Vandelli, viz. a Western form, inhabiting the Spanish peninsula, Morocco, and Algiers, for which the name B. cinereus must be retained, and an Eastern form, occurring in Asia Minor, which he named Amphisbæna Strauchi. My attention being drawn to this question, I have reviewed the series of Blanus in the British Museum; and the result has not only confirmed Dr. v. Bedriaga's conclusions, but brought to light a third form, represented by several specimens from the river Xanthus, Asia Minor, and which must likewise be regarded as a species, which I will name B. Bedriagæ; its characters are as follows:—

Intermaxillary teeth seven, maxillaries three on each side, mandibulars seven on each side. Snout prominent. Three lower labials, the first and second large, the third small; the suture between the frontal and the second labial nearly as long as that between the latter and the ocular. No cervical fold separating the head from the body. Annuli 101 to 114 on the body, 19 to 21 on the tail; an annulus contains 16 to 18 dorsal and 18 to 20 ventral segments. Preanal pores ten.

The other Oriental specimens of *Blanus* in the collection, and which bear the localities Constantinople and valley of the Meinder, agree in every respect with *B. Strauchi*, of which a specimen from Smyrna has been obtained from Dr. v. Bedriaga.

Stenostoma affine, sp. n.

Allied to S. albifrons, but distinguished by the much larger * Arch. f. Naturg. 1884, p. 23, pl. iv.

anterior labial shield, which is broader than either the nasolabial or the oculo-labial. Supraocular separated from the anterior labial. 7 longitudinal and 215 transverse series of scales. Brown above, brownish white beneath; the centre of the scales darker, but not forming such conspicuous markings as in S. albifrons. Total length 205 millim.; tail 16 millim.; diameter of body 4 millim.

One specimen from the province of Tachira, Venezuela.

Rana Masonii, sp. n.

Vomerine teeth in two slightly oblique series between the choanæ. Head moderate; snout rounded, slightly longer than the diameter of the orbit, with strong canthus rostralis; loreal region deeply concave; interorbital space a little broader than the upper eyelid; tympanum very distinct, half the size of the eye. Fingers rather slender, first extending slightly beyond second; toes moderate, nearly entirely webbed, tips of fingers and toes dilated into small disks; subarticular tubercles strong; inner metatarsal tubercle small, oval; no outer metatarsal tubercle. Hind limb very long; if carried forward, the femoro-tibial articulation reaches the axilla, and the tibio-tarsal articulation far beyond the tip of the snout. Skin smooth; a well-marked glandular lateral fold. Brown above; a blackish streak under the canthus rostralis and a large blackish temporal spot; tympanum light, dark in the centre; limbs with dark cross bars. Lower surfaces whitish, brownmottled on the throat and breast. From snout to vent 68 $_{
m millim}$.

Near Rana jerboa, Gthr., but well distinguished by the

shorter hind limb.

A single female specimen, from near Batavia, was presented by G. E. Mason, Esq.

Microhyla fissipes, sp. n.

Habit slender. Snout truncate, slightly longer than the orbital diameter; interorbital space broader than the upper eyelid. Fingers slender, first much shorter than second; toes long and slender, free, with a slight lateral fringe; tips of fingers and toes not swollen; subarticular tubercles distinct; two rather small, obtuse, metatarsal tubercles. The hind limb being carried forward along the body, the tibio-tarsal articulation reaches the eye. Skin nearly smooth above, with small warts on the sides. Olive-brown above, the small warts tinged with red; a darker lateral band from the tip of the snout, passing through the eye down to the middle of the side; an elongate X-shaped darker marking commencing between the

eyes, and another, A-shaped, on sacral region; limbs with dark cross bars. From snout to vent 26 millim. One specimen from Taiwanfoo, S. Formosa.

Cæcilia Buckleyi, sp. n.

Maxillary teeth rather large, about 10 on each side; vomeropalatines 8 on each side; inner mandibulars small, few; outer mandibulars large, especially the most anterior, 9 on each side. Snout broad, rounded, not very prominent, shorter than the distance between the eyes; latter very distinct; tentacle below the nostril. Body short for the genus, cylindrical; 175 circular folds, all complete. Tail indistinct, rounded. Olive above, lighter beneath and round the lower jaw; throat olive. Total length 160 millim.; diameter of body 4 millim.

A single specimen, probably young, collected at Intac, Ecuador, by Mr. Buckley.

XLVI.—On the Genus Megascolex of Templeton. By F. E. Beddard, M.A., F.R.S.E.

In a recent paper by Dr. Horst* of Leyden, the author, in describing a collection of earthworms belonging to the genus Perichæta of Schmarda, takes occasion to point out the identity of this genus with another genus established fifteen years previously by Templeton, viz. Megascolex. Having recently had an opportunity, through the kindness of Dr. Traquair and Prof. F. Jeffrey Bell, of examining several specimens preserved in the British Museum and the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art, which are undoubtedly Templeton's Megascolex caruleus, I think it worth while to point out that these two genera, Megascolex and Perichæta, are by no means identical, but present numerous and important differences. In the paper already mentioned Dr. Horst recapitulates the main points in Templeton's original description of Megascolex caruleus, and calls attention to the misinterpretations of this description introduced by subsequent writers; there is no doubt that these misinterpretations, for which Schmarda is mainly responsible, in reality caused Perrier† and Vaillant‡ to separate the genera Megascolex and Perichæta in their tables of classification, since there is nothing in Templeton's description itself which would

^{*} Notes from the Leyden Museum, vol. v. no. xvii.

[†] Nouv. Arch. du Mus. t. viii. (1872). ‡ Ann. Sci. Nat. sér. 5, x. (1868).